

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Yuji NAGANO et al.

Group Art Unit : S. CHOI

Appl. No. : 10/530,415

Art Unit: 3724

Filed : April 7, 2005

Confirmation No. : 4904

For : SAW BLADE

RESPONSE TO ELECTION REQUIREMENT WITH TRAVERSE

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop AMENDMENT
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir :

In response to the Examiner's Election Requirement of October 11, 2006, setting a one month period for response to extend until November 13, 2006 (November 11, 2006 being a Saturday), Applicants elect Species F (identified by the Examiner as the embodiment shown in Fig. 6) with traverse for the reasons expressed below. Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are considered to be "readable" on the Species F, and at least claim 1 is considered to be generic by the Applicants. Regarding the inclusion of claims 6 and 7, Applicants note the embodiment shown in Fig. 6 includes a bevel-dovetail shaped straight tooth.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Election Requirement.

Applicants note that the Examiner has recognized that the present application is a national stage (filed under 35 U.S.C. § 371) application and has apparently made the requirement under PCT Rule 13.1. However, Applicants submit that requirements for lack of unity of invention do not contemplate election of species such as are appropriate when an application is filed under 35 U.S.C. § 111. Accordingly, the requirement for unity of invention is improper for at least this reason, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the requirement for lack of unity of invention.

Applicants further submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a lack of unity of invention. In this regard, Applicants note that the Examiner has not pointed out any specific special technical features recited in the claims, but instead, merely states: "the species contain different combinations of special technical features of the invention." Applicants submit that such a blanket statement can not reasonably be characterized as establishing a lack of unity of invention between the groups of claims. For at least this additional reason, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the requirement for lack of unity of invention.

Additionally, it would appear that the search for the species identified by the Examiner would be coextensive or at least significantly overlap. For this additional reason, and consistent with office policy as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 803, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Election Requirement.

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the Election Requirement (requirement for lack of unity of invention) in this application is improper and it is respectfully requested that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Yuji NAGANO et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

Daniel B. Moon
Reg. No. 48,214

November 8, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191